

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450
www.usplo.gov

CONFIRMATION NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE 1508.65123 2317 01/12/2001 Manabu Sawasaki 09/759,424 EXAMINER 04/20/2004 7590 24978 NGUYEN, DUNG T GREER, BURNS & CRAIN 300 S WACKER DR PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT 25TH FLOOR 2871 CHICAGO, IL 60606 DATE MAILED: 04/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	- 11
			on
Office Action Summary  The MAILING DATE of this communication app	09/759,424	SAWASAKI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dung Nguyen	th the correspondence address	
Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet wh	in the correspondence address	33 <i></i>
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a replif NO period for reply specified above, the maximum statutory period.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON e, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this commu ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	unication.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20.	lanuary 2004.		
2a)⊠ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)☐ Thi	s action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowed	ance except for formal matte	ers, prosecution as to the me	erits is
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1,8,22,23,32-41,47,48 and 56-68 is/	are pending in the application	on.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) 54 and 55 is/are with	hdrawn from consideration.		
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>32-41</u> is/are allowed.			•
6) Claim(s) <u>1,8,22,23,47,48,56,58 and 64</u> is/are	rejected.		
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>57,59-63 and 65-68</u> is/are objected t			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) □ ac	cepted or b) objected to I	by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeyan	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	ction is required if the drawing(	s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1	.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-	152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	<i>y</i>		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	n priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:			
1. Certified copies of the priority documer			
2. Certified copies of the priority documer			
3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri	•	received in this National Sta	ge
application from the International Bures	**	ranaiyad	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	t of the certified copies not	received.	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		lummary (PTO-413)	
<ul> <li>2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08</li> </ul>	[7]	s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152	2)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) 🔲 Other:		

Art Unit: 2871

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Species A, claims 1 and 8, in Paper No. dated 01/20/2004 is acknowledged.

### Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Paragraph beginning on page 81, line 26, "263K" should be corrected as --263R--

Appropriate correction is required.

### Claim Objections

- 3. Claim 62 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form: the limitation of claim 62 is cited in claim 61.
- 4. Claim 59 is objected to because of the following informalities: "0.4 gm" should be corrected as  $-0.4 \mu m$ --. Appropriate correction is required.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

- 5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 6. Claims 1, 8 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lien et al., US Patent No. 6,493,050, as stated in the previous office action.

The above claims are anticipated by Lien et al. figures 1 and 16 which disclose a liquid crystal display (LCD) device comprising:

Art Unit: 2871

- . a pair of substrates (102, 104);
- . a liquid crystal layer (101);
- a color filter (106);
- . a common electrode (122);
- cell gap adjusting spacers (post spacer 108) formed on one of the pair of substrates (102), wherein adjacent edges of color filters are covered with the cell gap adjusting spacers;
- domain defining projections (114) with same material (col. 5, last paragraph) and having a height lower than the spacers as claimed (figure 16).
- 7. Claims 22-23 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kishimoto et al., US Patent No. 6,281,960.

The above claims are anticipated by Kishimoto et al. figures 1 and 5B which discloses an LCD device comprising:

- . a pair of substrates (2, 32);
- . a liquid crystal layer (50);
- . first spacers (48) for deciding a cell gap;
- . second spacers (10) having a height lower than the first spacers as claimed.

wherein the first spacers laminating a plurality of films (BM, B, G, R) inherently having a different compressive displacement (i.e., different elasticity) as well as different from the second spacers compressive displacement.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Art Unit: 2871

9. Claims 47-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kishimoto et al., US Patent No. 6,281,960, in view of Miyazaki et al., US Patent No. 5,815,232.

Regarding the above claims, Kishimoto et al. discloses the claimed invention as described above except for columns formed of a plurality of color filters that are laminated in the liquid crystal injection port. Miyazaki et al. do disclose columns (island shape spacers) are positioned at the liquid crystal injection area (see abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ a column at a liquid crystal injection area as shown by Miyazaki et al. in order to keep an uniform gap at the liquid crystal injection area (see abstract).

## Allowable Subject Matter

- 10. Claims 32-41 are allowed.
- 11. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

None of prior art disclose, singly or combined, an LCD device having a plurality of spacers interposed between two substrates, wherein the spacers are formed to satisfy all condition as set forth in claims 32-33. Furthermore, pixel regions include both first pixel regions, in which a final protection film is interposed between pixel electrodes and a transparent substrate, and second pixel regions, in which the final protection film is not interposed between the pixel electrodes and the transparent substrate as set forth in claims 34 and 38.

12. Claims 57, 59-63 and 65-68 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2871

### Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments filed 09/12/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive:

### Applicants' argument:

- a. Regarding claims 1 and 8, Lien does not disclose that the spacers cover adjacent edges of color filters.
- b. Regarding claim 22, Lien does not teach first and second spacers of differing respective heights and the lower spacer (ridges 114) does not function as spacers.
- c. Regarding claims 22-24, Kishimoto et al. does not disclose two different spacers of two differing respective heights.
- d. Regarding claims 22-24, Kishimoto walls 10 do not function as spacers.
- e. Regarding claims 47-48, neither Kishimoto nor Miyazaki et al. disclose two different gap holding spacers as claimed.

# The Examiner's responses to Applicants' argument:

- a. Lien et al. clearly disclose the spacers (e.g., spacer 108) covering adjacent edges of color filters (i.e. edges of color filter 502 and 504) (see figure 16).
- b. In figure 16, Lien et al. disclose first spacer (108) and a second spacer (134). It clearly show first and second spacers of differing respective heights. Furthermore, a pretilt control structure (e.g. 134) has occupied a volume in a liquid crystal layer space, so as it would be acted as a spacer. In other words, the pretilt control structure and a spacer would have the same function as well.

Art Unit: 2871

- c. Kishimo et al. figure 1 disclose an LCD having a first spacer (48)(stacked of color filters B/G/R and BM) and a second spacer (10)(BM only)and such two spacers clearly have different respective heights.
- d. As stated in part b, Kishimoto walls 10 would be performed as a spacer as well.
- e. As stated in part c, Kishimoto et al. clearly disclose two different spacers of two differing respective heights. Therefore, the modification to Kishimoto et al. would render claims 47-48 at least obvious.

#### Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2871

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-2297. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert H. Kim can be reached on 571-272-2293. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DN 04/19/2004 Dung Nguyen Primary Examiner Art Unit 2871